

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1-19 are in this application. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended to recite in part as follows:

“...extracting from the input data similar input data having a value close to a value of **given input data included in the input data**...” (Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-12, 16, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mine, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,566).

In explaining the above rejection, the Examiner relied on col. 5, line 56 to col. 6, line 40 of Mine to disclose the extraction and processing means of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portion of Mine (hereinafter “Mine”) does not teach the extracting means of claim 1 nor does it teach the extracting step of claim 19. That is, Mine discloses a similarity unit 18 that merely calculates a similarity using an edge magnitude of a model image, an edge direction of the model image, and an edge direction of the input image. Mine does not disclose the extraction of input data that have values similar to a value of given input data within the input data.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Li, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,934).

Figure 5 of Li discloses that sub images are generated by lowpass filtering of the original image. The difference between the sub images and the original image are calculated. Li does not disclose extracting data from the original image that have a value similar to the sub image as in the present claims. Further, the sub image is not included in the original image when the difference between the two images are calculated, whereas, as described in claims 1 and 19, the given input data used in the extraction means and extraction step is included in the input data.

Accordingly, for reasons described above amended independent claims 1 and 19, as well as claims 2-18, which depend from claim 1, are believed to be distinguishable from the prior art applied by the Examiner and, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to explain why claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance regarding these claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney in order to discuss any further outstanding issues.

Early and favorable consideration are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 

Gordon Kessler
Reg. No. 38,511
(212) 588-0800